UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,527	11/02/2006	Andrew James Brown	Pb60728USW	2346
23347 GLAXOSMITH	7590 05/20/200 HKLINE	EXAMINER		
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, MAI B482			RICCI, CRAIG D	
	FIVE MOORE DR., PO BOX 13398 RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-3398		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			4161	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/20/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USCIPRTP@GSK.COM LAURA.M.MCCULLEN@GSK.COM JULIE.D.MCFALLS@GSK.COM

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Occurrence	10/597,527	BROWN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	CRAIG RICCI	4161				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	-· action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		secution as to the merits is				
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 4-7</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>1 and 4-7</u> are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
	animor. Note the attached Cines	7.00.017.017.17.17.07.02.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attach manut/a)						
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
Notice of References Cited (P10-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT0-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/597,527 Page 2

Art Unit: 4161

DETAILED ACTION

Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 7 drawn to a composition.

Group II, claim(s) 1-6, drawn to a method of using the invention of Group I where R¹ is a carbocycle.

Group III, claim(s) 1-6, drawn to a method of using the invention of Group I where R¹ is a heterocycle.

Group IV, claim(s) 1-6, drawn to a method of using the invention of Group I where R¹ is a noncyclic.

2. As set forth in Rule 13.1 of the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), "the international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept." Moreover, as stated in PCT Rule 13.2, "where a group of inventions is claimed in one and the same international application, the requirement of unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features." Furthermore, Rule 13.2 defines "special technical features" as "those technical features that define a

contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art."

3. The inventions listed as Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The special technical feature of Group II is a CB2 modulator. The CB2 modulator of claim 4 does not present a contribution over the prior art. As disclosed in *Suto et al* (WO 97/09315)(Page 5), which is included on Applicant's IDS dated July 28, 2006, the special technical feature of instant claim 4 is anticipated. As such, Group II does not share a special technical feature with the instant claims of Group I-IV. Therefore, the claims are not so linked within the meaning of PCT Rule 13.2 so as to form a single inventive concept, and unity between Groups I-IV is broken.

4. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the

requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder**. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Election of Species

5. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

If Group II-IV is elected, the following species elections are required:

- a) CB2 modulator (a compound of formula (I), (II), or (IV)) recited by claim 4;
 - b) Each compound species of formulas (I) (IV) recited by claims 4;
- c) PDE4 inhibitor (cilomilast, AWD-12-281, NCS-613, D-4418, etc) as recited by claim 5;

Application/Control Number: 10/597,527

Art Unit: 4161

d) Each condition to be treated (immune disorder, inflammatory disorder, pain, rheumatoid arthritis, multiple sclerosis, etc) as recited by claim 6.

Page 5

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Specifically, as to claim 4. Applicant is required to elect a single compound species from the compounds of formula (I), (II), (III), or (IV). Additionally, as to claim 4, if formula (I) is elected, Applicant is required to define each of R¹-R⁷, R^{8a}-R^{8b}, R⁹, m, g, p, Y, X, n and any additional variables as required for a particular species (a species for example is methyl, NOT alkyl). If formula (II) is elected, Applicant is required to define each of R¹-R⁷, R_a-R_b, x, n, A, Y and any additional variables as required for a particular species (a species for example is methyl, NOT alkyl). If formula (III) is elected, Applicant is required to define each of R¹-R⁴, R⁶, R¹⁰, R_a-R_b, m, A, Y and any additional variables as required for a particular species (a species for example is methyl, NOT alkyl). If formula (IV) is elected. Applicant is required to define each of R¹-R⁷, R^{8a}-R^{8b}, R⁹-R¹⁰, m. q. p. x and any additional variables as required for a particular species (a species for example is methyl, NOT alkyl). As to claim 5, Applicant is required to elect a single PDE4 inhibitor from the PDE4 inhibitors recited by claim 5. As to claims 6, Applicant is required to elect a single condition or disease to be treated or improved by the compound as recited by claim 6. Upon Applicant's election of species, the result must provide a single chemical species and a single condition or disease to be treated or improved. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species,

including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

- 6. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner: all claims are generic.
- 7. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:
- a-b) The CB2 modulator of instant claim 4 formula I is encompassed by *Suto et al* (WO 97/09315)(Page 5) which is included on Applicant's IDS dated July 28, 2006.

 Accordingly the CB2 species of instant claim 4 lack a special technical feature.
- c) The PDE4 inhibitor roflumilast, as recited by instant claim 5, in the treatment of inflammatory disorders is known in the art (see Hatzelmann and Schudt. J Pharmacol Exp Ther, 297(1):267-279, 2001; abstract). Accordingly, the PDE4 inhibitors of instant claim 5 lack a special technical feature.
- d) Each disease or condition to be treated or improved has distinct pathologies and thus lack a special technical feature.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Page 7

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record

showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CRAIG RICCI whose telephone number is (571)270-5864. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, and every other Friday, 7:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Nolan can be reached on (571) 272-0847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/597,527 Page 9

Art Unit: 4161

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CRAIG RICCI/ Examiner, Art Unit 4161

/Patrick J. Nolan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4161